

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 6 are newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Epps et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,977,930). Applicant respectfully submits the following in traversal.

Rejection of claims 1 and 6 under §112, second paragraph

Applicant submits that claims 1 and 6 comply with § 112, second paragraph, because the recitations therein are not vague or indefinite. In part, claim 1 recites:

an output unit for dividing the IP packet trailer into second data in second units of transmission, the IP packet trailer being read from the packet memory management unit based on the pointer of the IP packet header transmitted from the header processing unit and the reported pointer of the IP packet trailer to be connected to the IP packet header, and outputting the second data to a channel

In an exemplary embodiment of the invention, ¶40 of the specification discloses that:

The output unit 700 divides the IP packet header and the trailer respectively provided from the header processing unit 600 and the packet memory management unit 400 into predetermined units of data transmission, such as units of ATM cells. An ATM header is created on the respective divided ATM cells for an output to a channel.

In other words, the exemplary embodiment of the invention describe how the IP packet trailer is divided into predetermined units. The predetermined units may be in units of ATM cells.

Additionally, the second units would be units that are smaller than the size of the IP packet trailer, since the claim recites that the IP packet trailer is divided into second data, i.e., divided into second pieces of data. Also, to address the Examiner's last comment, Applicant notes that an IP packet trailer would correspond to a single IP packet header.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 complies with § 112, second paragraph. For similar reasons, Applicant submits that claim 6 complies with § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection of claims 1-12 under § 102(e) over Epps et al.

Applicant maintains the position that claims 1-12 are patentable over Epps. We would essentially repeat our previous arguments. Specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner cites column 9, line 40-45 of Epps as allegedly disclosing an output unit for dividing the IP packet trailer read from the packet memory management unit into second data in second units of transmission based on the pointer of the IP packet header. The cited section, however, merely discloses packet header buffers (PHBs), and do not mention dividing the IP packet trailer read from the packet memory management unit.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that column 27, lines 45-53 and column 40, line 4-12 merely disclose an Receive Buffer Manager queue manager 1210 and a Fabric Interface Module 170. In the sections cited by the Examiner, there is no mention of the RBM 1210 or the FIM 170 performing any function which would correspond to "the IP packet trailer being read from the packet memory management unit based on the pointer of the IP packet header transmitted from

the header processing unit and the reported pointer of the IP packet trailer to be connected to the IP packet header, and outputting the second data to a channel,” as recited in claim 1.

For the above reasons and for the reasons submitted in the previous Amendment of December 4, 2007, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12 are patentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

S. Stuart Lee  
Registration No. 61,124

Date: July 31, 2008